

**A.—Sri M. V. RAMA RAO (Minister for Home and Labour).—**

(a) Two cases were registered in Crime Nos. 33/62 and 19/65 of Bagalkot Rural Police Station and 33 chargesheets were filed.

(b) Sections 406, 409, 418, 420 and 120B of the Indian Penal Code.

(c) Rs. 1,04,594.

(d) Government decided on 19th May 1965 to withdraw from prosecution in these cases as it was considered inexpedient to prosecute them.

(e) The present Home Minister held the Home Portfolio when the Court granted consent to the withdrawal from prosecution on 19th September 1966, 21st October 1966 and 24th October 1966.

(f) No.

### **Cases filed against the Managing Director, Bagalkot Cement Factory**

**5. Sri MAHADEV G. BANAKAR (Byadgi).—**

Will the Minister for Home and Labour be pleased to state :—

(a) the number of cases filed against the Managing Director, Bagalkot Cement Factory, in connection with the misappropriation of money ;

(b) the amount misappropriated by him ;

(c) the amount spent by them in respect of the said cases ;

(d) the stage at which the said cases are pending ?

**A.—Sri M. V. RAMA RAO (Minister for Home and Labour).—**

(a) and (b) Two cases were registered in Crime No. 33/62 and 19/65 of Bagalkot Rural Police Station and 33 charge-sheets were filed involving an amount of Rs. 5,02,509-00.

(c) Rs. 1,04,594.

(d) The cases were ordered to be withdrawn.

**Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.**—Will the Minister be pleased to state what were the considerations that weighed with them to consider that it was inexpedient to prosecute them ?

† **Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.**—The main considerations were, the complaint had been lodged against the Managing Director in regard to the transactions involving certain amounts of money and other accusations. Investigations were made in regard to his bona fide integrity and investigation was carried on and a charge sheet lodged. But it appeared the general body of the Share-holders of the company had appointed a

Committee to go into the alleged irregularities and it found that there was no mala fide on the part of the Managing Director who had also deposited a sum of Rs. 2.1 lakhs in respect of the transactions and the general body of shareholders considered that there was no mala fide on his part. Therefore The Government considered there was no point to prosecute him. There is Union Government Company Law Administration to satisfy itself if any misfeasance found by the managing Director.

**Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.**—Is it correct on the part of the Government to withdraw the case because of the Shareholders decision? There are severe charges under sections 406, 418, 420 and 120B. Is it right to have been in the position of a Judge and how did they take it away from the purview of the Court, in other words giving the share holders to play the part of a Judge.

**Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.**—The share-holders did not play the part of the Judge and the cases have been ordered to be withdrawn by the order of the presiding Judge of the Court of the Session before whom the cases had been committed for trial.

**Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.**—Were not these cases ordered to be withdrawn on the representation of the Public Prosecutor? Who authorised him?

**Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.**—The Public Prosecutor never represented like that and nobody authorised him to do so.

**Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.**—Then what made the Government to pass such an order? Have they connived with them?

**Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.**—There was no question of connivance. What the Government have done is allright.

**ಶ್ರೀ ಎಲ್. ಶ್ರೀಕಂಠಯ್ಯ.**—ಚಾರ್ಜ್‌ಶೀಟ್ ಹಾಕುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುನ್ನ ಮ್ಯಾರಾಫೆಂಡಿ ಇದೆ ಅಂತ ಕಂಪ್ಲೇಂಟ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟವರು ಯಾರು? ಮ್ಯಾರಾಫೆಂಡಿ ಅಲ್ಲ ಅಂತ ಕೇಸನ್ನು ಡ್ರಾಪ್ ಮಾಡಿದ ಮೇಲೆ ಫಾರ್ಸ್ ಇನ್‌ಫರ್ಮೇಷನ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟವರಮೇಲೆ ಚಾರ್ಜ್‌ಶೀಟ್ ಹಾಕಿದ್ದೀರಾ?

**Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.**—No action is deemed necessary in regard to this matter. The General Body went into the matter and ratified the action of the Managing Director and the matter is now ceased. An Inspector has been appointed to go into the matter and he is proceeding with the investigation.

**Sri L. SRIKANTIAH.**—When it was alleged to be criminal case, why did you take action to withdraw the case?

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—It has been answered. There may be different reasons for withdrawing the case.

**Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.**—It is only connivance that has inspired them to withdraw these cases.

**ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಎನ್. ನಂಜೇಗೌಡ.**—ಹಾಗೆ ಅವರು ಒಂದು ತಪ್ಪು ದೂರನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರಿಂದ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಇನ್‌ವೆಸ್ಟಿಗೇಟ್ ಮಾಡಲು ಒಂದು ಲಕ್ಷ ನಾಲ್ಕು ಸಾವಿರದ ಐನೂರ ತೊಂಬತ್ತು ನಾಲ್ಕು ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳು ಖರ್ಚಾಗಿವೆ. ಹಾಗೆ ಅವರು ಸುಳ್ಳು ದೂರನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಪೊಲೀಸರು ಏಕೆ ಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳಲಿಲ್ಲ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have already called Mr. Banakar. Now you intervene and put questions. How can you put the supplementary ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಶ್ರೀಕಂಠಯ್ಯ.—ಈ ಆಪಾದನೆಗಳು ಸುಳ್ಳಾದವುಗಳೆಂದು ಪೊಲೀಸರು ಥಾರ್ಪ್ ಪೀಟ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ಹಿಂದಕ್ಕೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಮೇಲೆ ಸುಳ್ಳು ಘರಾಟವನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟವರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಏಕೆ ಕ್ರಮ ಕೊಗೊಳ್ಳಲಿಲ್ಲ ?

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—I have already said that no such action is considered necessary when the matter is still under enquiry by the Company Law Administration.

ಶ್ರೀ ಮಹದೇವ್ ಜಿ. ಬಣಕಾರ್.—ಇಂಥ ಒಂದು ದೊಡ್ಡ ಹಣದ ದುರುಪಯೋಗದ ಪ್ರಕರಣ ದಲ್ಲ ನರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಿಗೂ ಮೇಲ್ಪಟ್ಟು ಖರ್ಚುಬಂದಿದ್ದಾಗ್ಯೂ ತಪ್ಪು ದೂರನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟವರಮೇಲೆ ಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳದೆ, ಇಲ್ಲವೆ ತಪ್ಪಿತಸ್ಥರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಉಗ್ರ ಕ್ರಮವನ್ನೂ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳದೆ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಅಂದರೆ ಮೈಸೂರು ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ನಡಿಗೆ 5 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ತಪ್ಪಿತಸ್ಥರನ್ನು ಬಿಡುಗಡೆ ಮಾಡರಾಯಿತೆಂದು ಹೇಳರಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ ಅದು ನಿಜವೇ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಎ. ರಾಮರಾವ್.—ಈ ಮಾತು ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣವಾಗಿ ನಿರಾಧಾರವಾದದ್ದು ಅಂತ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Question hour is over.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—In view of the importance of this question, I request you to allow half an hour discussion on this subject.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The member may please put it in writing.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—By accident such questions always come last.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I do not know the implication of saying that such questions come last. If anything is, implied he may tell me. If there is nothing he should not make such remarks.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—The implication is sheer accident. There is no motive.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I would suggest to the members if necessary to make a request that a particular question may come first. What does it matter to me ; When there are 100 replies, I have no objection for any question being included in the list. But members do not apply their mind.

2-00 P.M.

Sri C. K. RAJIAH SETTY.—At least in future you can kindly see that held over questions get priority, because such questions are held over for want of information or information is not correct.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have no objection if the House so desires. Let the Business Advisory Committee apply its mind and tell me.